arXiv:1208.6112v3 [cs.SC] 3 Sep 2012

Generic Regular Decompositions for Generic Zero-Dimensional Systems

Xiaoxian Tang* Zhenghong Chen Bican Xia
LMAM & School of Mathematical Sciences
Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
tangxiaoxian@pku.edu.cn, chenzhenghong@pku.edu.cn, xbc@math.pku.edu.cn

Abstract

Two new concepts, generic regular decomposition and regular-decomposition-unstable (RDU) variety for generic zero-dimensional systems, are introduced in this paper and an algorithm is proposed for computing a generic regular decomposition and the associated RDU variety of a given generic zero-dimensional system simultaneously. The solutions of the given system can be expressed by finitely many zero-dimensional regular chains if the parameter value is not on the RDU variety. The so called weakly relatively simplicial decomposition plays a crucial role in the algorithm, which is based on the theories of subresultant chains. Furthermore, the algorithm can be naturally adopted to compute a non-redundant Wu's decomposition and the decomposition is stable at any parameter value that is not on the RDU variety. The algorithm has been implemented with Maple 15 and experimented with a number of benchmarks from the literature. Empirical results are also presented to show the good performance of the algorithm.

Keywords: generic zero-dimensional system, regular-decomposition-unstable variety, parametric triangular decomposition, generic regular decomposition

1 Introduction

Solving parametric polynomial systems is usually a key problem in many research and applied areas, such as automated geometry theorem deduction, stability analysis of dynamical systems, robotics and so on [4, 13, 21]. By "solving", we often mean to determine (1) for what parameter values the polynomial system has solutions, and (2) whether the solutions can be expressed by some simple representations.

Generally speaking, there are two kinds of methods for solving the above questions (1) and (2), *i.e.*, the methods based on *Gröbner bases* [10, 13, 14, 21] and *triangular decompositions* [1, 4, 6, 9, 11, 17, 18, 22, 24, 26, 27].

For parametric systems, the concepts of comprehensive Gröbner system (CGS) and comprehensive Gröbner bases (CGB) introduced by Weispfenning in [21] and the algorithms for computing them [10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 21] are powerful tools for answering questions (1) and (2). The first CGB algorithm introduced in [21] suffers from the problem of too many redundant branches. Many improved algorithms have been proposed since then [10, 13, 14, 15, 16], among which, the one proposed by Suzuki and Sato [15] was accepted widely by subsequent researchers. The latest progress on this subject was reported by Kapur *et al.* [10]. They solved the famous P3P problem [7] by computing CGS and provided empirical data illustrating that the CGS method could solve practical problems in amazingly short time.

The methods based on triangular decompositions have been studied by many researchers since Wu's work [22]. A significant concept in the theories of triangular sets is "regular chain" (or "normal chain") introduced by Kalkbrener [9] and Yang and Zhang [27] independently. Gao and Chou proposed a method in [6] for identifying all parametric values for which a given system has solutions and giving the solutions by $p-$chains[1] without a partition of the parameter space. Wang generalized the concept of regular chain to regular system and gave an efficient algorithm for computing it [18, 19, 20]. It should be noticed that, due to their strong projection property, the regular systems or series computed by `RegSer`[2] may also be used as representations for parametric systems. The concept of comprehensive triangular decomposition (CTD) introduced by Chen *et al.* in [4] can answer questions (1) and (2). Algorithms for computing regular chain decompositions and CTDs have been implemented as central functions of `RegularChains` library in Maple 15.

---

*Corresponding author

For a given parametric system $\mathbf{P}$ with n variables and d parameters, many existing algorithms for computing regular decomposition over a certain ring K will give a regular zero-decomposition of $\mathbf{P}$ in $\overline{K}^{n+d}$. Then, if one wants to answer questions (1) and (2), one may try computing projections from the solution space (the zero-decomposition) to the parametric space by the methods introduced in [4, 19]. On the other hand, there are some other methods, such as Wu's method [22] and relatively simplicial decomposition (RSD) [27], which consider parameters as "constants" during the process of decomposition and can obtain zero-decompositions of $\mathbf{P}$ in $\overline{K[U]}^{n}$ where U stands for the d parameters. In this paper, we follow the idea of the latter methods and propose an algorithm for computing a so-called *generic regular decomposition* $\mathbb{T}$ of a generic zero-dimensional system $\mathbf{P}$ in $\overline{K[U]}^{n}$ (see Definition 4). At the same time, the algorithm will obtain a parametric polynomial such that the regular decomposition is *stable* at any parametric point outside the variety generated by the parametric polynomial and we call the variety regular-decomposition-unstable (RDU) variety. Roughly speaking, "stable at a parametric point" means that the regular decomposition will keep after we substitute the point for the parameters in $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbb{T}$ (see Definition 4). As a result, questions (1) and (2) for generic zero-dimensional systems are answered except for the case when parameters are on the RDU variety. That's why the decomposition is called *generic* regular chain decomposition.

The proposed algorithm is based on *weakly relatively simplicial decomposition*, a new concept that is weaker than *relatively simplicial decomposition* proposed by Yang *et al.* in [27] and inspired by the method for computing regular systems introduced by Wang in [18, 19]. In addition, the proposed algorithm can be naturally adopted to compute a non-redundant Wu's decomposition for a given generic zero-dimensional system. Furthermore, computing RDU varieties can be regarded as the first step of computing *border polynomial* (BP), which is a crucial concept introduced by Yang *et al.* [24, 25, 26] for solving the real root classification (RRC) problem of parametric semi-algebraic systems. As a matter of fact, a RDU variety of a generic zero-dimensional system *with respect to* (*w.r.t.*) a generic regular decomposition is a subvariety of the hypersurface generated by a certain BP. The new algorithm has been implemented on the basis of DISCOVERER [23] with Maple 15 and experimented with a number of benchmarks from the literature [4, 5, 10, 13, 14]. Empirical results are also presented to show the good performance of the algorithm.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives basic definitions and concepts that are needed to understand the main algorithm. Section 3 contains the main algorithm, namely Algorithm 3, and some relative subalgorithms, especially the subalgorithm for computing weakly relatively simplicial decompositions. Besides, proofs for these algorithms are presented in this section and an illustrative example is given. The empirical data and comparison with previous works along with several implementation details are presented in Section 4. Section 5 concludes the paper with a discussion on our future work along this direction.

2 Preliminaries

The following paragraphs give a brief outline of the vocabulary and tools we will be using throughout the paper. All concepts without precise definitions can be found in [2, 22, 26]. Several illustrative examples are presented. In these specifical examples, $\mathbb{R}$ and $\mathbb{C}$ stand for the feild of real numbers and the field of complex numbers, respectively.

Suppose $\{u_1, \ldots, u_d, x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ is a set of indeterminates with a given order $u_1 \prec \ldots \prec u_d \prec x_1 \prec \ldots \prec x_n$ where $\{u_1, \ldots, u_d\}$ and $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ are the sets of parameters and variables, respectively. Let $U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_d\}$ and $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$. Suppose K is a unique factorization domain and $\overline{K}$ is its algebraic closure. Let $K[U]$ be the ring of polynomials in U with coefficients in K and let $\overline{K[U]}$ be the algebraic closure of $K[U]$. Let $K[U][X]$ be the ring of polynomials in X with coefficients in the ring $K[U]$. Let $\overline{K}[X]$ be the ring of polynomials in X with coefficients in the field $\overline{K}$. A non-empty finite subset $\mathbf{P}$ of $K[U][X]$ is said to be a *system*. If $\mathbf{P} \subset K[U][X] \backslash K[X]$, it is a *parametric system*. If $\mathbf{P} \subset K[X]$, it is a *constant system*.

---

[1] The concept $p-$chain is stronger than regular chain, see more details in [6].

[2] http://www-calfor.lip6.fr/~wang/epsilon/

For a non-empty finite subset $\mathbf{P} \subset K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$, $\langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{K[U][X]}$ $(\langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{\overline{K}[X]})$ denotes the ideal generated by $\mathbf{P}$ in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ and $\mathrm{sqrt}(\langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{K[U][X]})$ $(\mathrm{sqrt}(\langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{\overline{K}[X]}))$ denotes the radical ideal of $\langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{K[U][X]}$ $(\langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{\overline{K}[X]})$. For any F in $K[U][X] \backslash \{0\}$ $(\overline{K}[X] \backslash \{0\})$ and for any $x \in X$, if x appears in F, F can be regarded as a univariate polynomial in x, namely $F = C_0 x^m + C_1 x^{m-1} + \ldots + C_m$ where $C_0, C_1, \ldots, C_m$ are polynomials in $K[U][X \backslash \{x\}]$ $(\overline{K}[X \backslash \{x\}])$ and $C_0 \neq 0$. Then m is the *leading degree* of F *w.r.t.* x and is denoted by $\deg(F, x)$. Note that if x doesn't appear in F, $\deg(F, x) = 0$. If there exists p $(1 \leq p \leq n)$ such that $\deg(F, x_p) > 0$ and for every i $(p < i \leq n)$, $\deg(F, x_i) = 0$, then the *class* of F is p. If $\deg(F, x_i) = 0$ for every i $(1 \leq i \leq n)$, then the *class* of F is 0. The class of F in $K[U][X] \backslash \{0\}$ $(\overline{K}[X] \backslash \{0\})$ is denoted by cls_F. If $\mathrm{cls}_F > 0$, x_{cls_F} is the *main variable* of F and is denoted by $\mathrm{mvar}(F)$. Assume that $F = C_0 x_p^m + C_1 x_p^{m-1} + \ldots + C_m$ where $p = \mathrm{cls}_F > 0$ and $C_0 \neq 0$, then C_0, denoted by I_F, is the *initial* of F and x_p^m, denoted by $\mathrm{rank}(F)$, is the *rank* of F.

A non-empty finite set $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, T_2 \ldots, T_r\}$ of polynomials in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ is a *triangular set* in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ if $0 < \mathrm{cls}_{T_1} < \mathrm{cls}_{T_2} < \ldots < \mathrm{cls}_{T_r}$. For a triangular set $\mathbf{T}$ in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$, $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}$, $\mathrm{mvar}(\mathbf{T})$ and $\mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{T})$ denote $\Pi_{T \in \mathbf{T}} \mathrm{I}_T$, $\{\mathrm{mvar}(T) | T \in \mathbf{T}\}$ and $\{\mathrm{rank}(T) | T \in \mathbf{T}\}$, respectively. The *saturated ideal* of a triangular set $\mathbf{T}$ in $K[U][X]$ is defined as the set $\{F \in K[U][X] | {\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}}^s F \in \langle \mathbf{T} \rangle_{K[U][X]}$ for some positive integer $s\}$ and is denoted by $\mathrm{sat}(\mathbf{T})_{K[U][X]}$. Similarly, the *saturated ideal* of a triangular set $\mathbf{T}$ in $\overline{K}[X]$ is defined as the set $\{F \in \overline{K}[X] | {\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}}^s F \in \langle \mathbf{T} \rangle_{\overline{K}[X]}$ for some positive integer $s\}$ and is denoted by $\mathrm{sat}(\mathbf{T})_{\overline{K}[X]}$. Suppose $F \in K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ and $\mathbf{T}$ is a triangular set in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$, then F is *reduced w.r.t.* $\mathbf{T}$ if $\deg(F, \mathrm{mvar}(T_i)) < \deg(T_i, \mathrm{mvar}(T_i))$ for every i $(1 \leq i \leq r)$. A triangular set $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, T_2 \ldots, T_r\}$ in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ is a *non-contradictory ascending chain* in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ if T_i is reduced *w.r.t.* $\{T_1, \ldots, T_{i-1}\}$ for every i $(2 \leq i \leq r)$. A single-element set $\{F\} \subset K[U]$ $(\{F\} \subset \overline{K})$ is a *contradictory ascending chain* in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ if $F \neq 0$. Remark that an *ascending chain* is either a non-contradictory ascending chain or a contradictory ascending chain.

For two polynomials F and P in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ and a variable $x \in X$, the *pseudo remainder* [27] of F *pseudo-divided* by P *w.r.t.* x is denoted by $\mathrm{prem}(F, P, x)$. Particularly, $\mathrm{prem}(F, P, \mathrm{mvar}(P))$ is denoted by $\mathrm{prem}(F, P)$. For a polynomial $F \in K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$ and a triangular set $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, ..., T_r\}$ in $K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$, the *successive pseudo remainder* [27] of F *w.r.t.* $\mathbf{T}$ is denoted by $\mathrm{prem}(F, \mathbf{T})$, namely

$$\mathrm{prem}(F, \mathbf{T}) = \mathrm{prem}(\ldots \mathrm{prem}(\mathrm{prem}(F, T_r), T_{r-1}), \ldots, T_1).$$

For a finite set $\mathbf{P} \subset K[U][X]$ $(\overline{K}[X])$, $\mathrm{prem}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{T})$ denotes the set $\{\mathrm{prem}(F, \mathbf{T}) \mid F \in \mathbf{P}\}$.

Now we'd like to present some results introduced in [22]. For $\mathbf{P} \subset K[U][X]$, suppose $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P})$ denotes the set

$$\{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \overline{K[U]}^n | P(U, a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 0, \forall P \in \mathbf{P}\}.$$

An ascending chain $\mathbf{C}$ in $K[U][X]$ is a *characteristic set* of $\mathbf{P}$ in $K[U][X]$ if $\mathbf{C} \subset \langle \mathbf{P} \rangle_{K[U][X]}$ and $\mathrm{prem}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbf{C}) = \{0\}$. According to Wu's method introduced in [22], for any non-empty finite subset $\mathbf{P} \subset K[U][X]$, there exists a finite sequence of ascending chains $\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{C}_m$ $(m \geq 1)$ in $K[U][X]$ such that

(1)$\mathbf{C}_m$ is a contradictory ascending chain and, if $m > 1$, $\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{C}_{m-1}$ is a finite sequence of non-contradictory ascending chains;

(2)$\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{C}_m$ is a finite sequence of characteristic sets in $K[U][X]$;

(3)If $m = 1$, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P}) = \emptyset$. Otherwise, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P}) = \cup_{i=1}^{m-1} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{C}_i \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_i})$.

The set of ascending chains $\{\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{C}_m\}$ above is said to be a *Wu's decomposition* or *characteristic set decomposition* of $\mathbf{P}$ in $K[U][X]$. In addition, if $m = 1$ or for every i $(1 \leq i \leq m - 1)$, $\mathrm{mvar}(\mathbf{C}_i) = X$, $\mathbf{P}$ is a *generic zero-dimensional system*. Remark that a Wu's decomposition may suffer from the redundant branches problem. That means, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{C}_i \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_i})$ can be an empty set for some non-contradictory ascending chain $\mathbf{C}_i$ $(1 \leq i \leq m-1)$ if $m > 1$.

Another important concept in the theories of triangular decompositions is regular chain. For two polynomials F and P in $K[U][X]$ ($\overline{K}[X]$) and a variable $x \in X$, the *resultant* [27] of F and P *w.r.t.* x is denoted by $\mathrm{res}(F, P, x)$. Particularly, $\mathrm{res}(F, P, \mathrm{mvar}(P))$ is denoted by $\mathrm{res}(F, P)$. For a polynomial $F \in K[U][X]$ ($\overline{K}[X]$) and a triangular set $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, ..., T_r\}$ in $K[U][X]$ ($\overline{K}[X]$), the *successive resultant* [27] of F *w.r.t.* $\mathbf{T}$ is denoted by $\mathrm{res}(F, \mathbf{T})$, namely

$$\mathrm{res}(F, \mathbf{T}) = \mathrm{res}(\ldots \mathrm{res}(\mathrm{res}(F, T_r), T_{r-1}), \ldots, T_1).$$

A triangular set $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, \ldots, T_r\}$ in $K[U][X]$ ($\overline{K}[X]$) is said to be a *regular chain* in $K[U][X]$ ($\overline{K}[X]$), if $\mathrm{I}_{T_1} \neq 0$ and for each i $(1 < i \leq r)$, $\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{T_i}, \{T_{i-1}, \ldots, T_1\}) \neq 0$. If $\mathbf{T}$ is a regular chain in $K[U][X]$ ($\overline{K}[X]$) and $\mathrm{mvar}(\mathbf{T}) = X$, $\mathbf{T}$ is a *zero-dimensional regular chain.* Regular chains have a series of good properties, some of which are listed below. For $\mathbf{P} \subset \overline{K}[X]$, suppose $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P})$ denotes the set $\{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \overline{K}^n | P(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = 0, \forall P \in \mathbf{P}\}$.

Proposition 1. [1, 4, 9, 18, 19, 27, 28] *If* $\mathbf{T}$ *is a regular chain in* $K[U][X]$ ($\overline{K}[X]$), *then* $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) \neq \emptyset$ ($\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) \neq \emptyset$).

Proposition 2. [1, 4, 9, 18, 19, 27, 28] *If* $\mathbf{T}$ *is a regular chain in* $K[U][X]$ *and* P *is a polynomial in* $K[U][X]$, *then*

(1)$\mathrm{prem}(P, \mathbf{T}) = 0$ *if and only if* $P \in \mathrm{sat}(\mathbf{T})_{K[U][X]}$;

(2)$\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) \subset \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(P)$ *if and only if* $P \in \mathrm{sqrt}(\mathrm{sat}(\mathbf{T})_{K[U][X]})$.

Furthermore, if $\mathbf{T}$ *is zero-dimensional, then*

(3)$\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(P) \neq \emptyset$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{res}(P, \mathbf{T}) = 0$.

Remark 1. [1, 4, 9, 18, 19, 27, 28] *This remark is an analogue of Proposition 2. If* $\mathbf{T}$ *is a regular chain in* $\overline{K}[X]$ *and* P *is a polynomial in* $\overline{K}[X]$, *then*

(1)$\mathrm{prem}(P, \mathbf{T}) = 0$ *if and only if* $P \in \mathrm{sat}(\mathbf{T})_{\overline{K}[X]}$;

(2)$\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) \subset \mathrm{V}(P)$ *if and only if* $P \in \mathrm{sqrt}(\mathrm{sat}(\mathbf{T})_{\overline{K}[X]})$.

Furthermore, if $\mathbf{T}$ *is zero-dimensional, then*

(3)$\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}) \cap \mathrm{V}(P) \neq \emptyset$ *if and only if* $\mathrm{res}(P, \mathbf{T}) = 0$.

Remark 2. *There exist various efficient algorithms for computing regular chain decompositions[1, 4, 9, 18, 19, 27, 28]. Regular chain decompositions don't suffer from redundant problem as Wu's decompositions owing to the fact that a regular chain always has solutions as shown in Proposition 1. It should be noted that the definition of triangular set and thus that of regular chain in* $K[U][X]$ *introduced above is not exactly the same as that introduced in [3, 4, 18] when dealing with parametric systems. For example, consider a parameter system* $\{u, x_1, x_2\}$ *in* $\mathbb{R}[u][x_1, x_2]$. *The system itself is a regular chain in* $\mathbb{R}[u][x_1, x_2] = \mathbb{R}[u, x_1, x_2]$ *according to the definition of regular chain introduced in [3, 4, 6, 18] and it is seen that the system has solutions if and only if the parameter value of* u *equals to zero. But* $\{u, x_1, x_2\}$ *is not a regular chain in* $\mathbb{R}[u][x_1, x_2]$ *in this paper. Because we demand that* $\mathrm{mvar}(\mathbf{T}) \subset X$ *for any triangular set* $\mathbf{T}$ *in* $K[U][X]$ *as defined before and parameters* $u_1, \ldots, u_d$ *are regarded as "constants" here. This idea is inspired from the point of view proposed in [22] and plays a key role throughout this paper. We need to give some more precise definitions at first, then we'll turn back to show how to solve this simple example by our method proposed in this paper.*

Definition 1. *Suppose* $\mathbf{P}$ *is a generic zero-dimensional system in* $K[U][X]$. *A finite set* $\mathbb{T}$ *of triangular sets in* $K[U][X]$ *is said to be a* parametric triangular decomposition *of* $\mathbf{P}$ *in* $K[U][X]$, *if* $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P}) = \cup_{\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{T}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}})$. *If* $\mathbb{T} = \emptyset$ *or* $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) \neq \emptyset$ *for any* $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{T}$, *the parametric triangular decomposition is said to be* non-redundant. *If* $\mathbb{T}$ *is a finite set of regular chains in* $K[U][X]$, *the parametric triangular decomposition is said to be a* parametric regular decomposition.

For each $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_d) \in \overline{K}^d$, $\phi_a : K[U][X] \longrightarrow \overline{K}[X]$ is a homomorphism such that $\phi_a(F) = F(a, X)$ for all $F \in K[U][X]$ and we denote $\phi_a(F)$ by $F(a)$. For a non-empty finite set $\mathbf{P} \subset K[U][X]$, $\mathbf{P}(a)$ denotes the set $\{F(a) | F \in \mathbf{P}\}$ and remark that $\mathbf{P}(a) = \emptyset$ if $\mathbf{P} = \emptyset$.

Definition 2. *Let* $\mathbb{T}$ *be a parametric triangular decomposition of a given generic zero-dimensional system* $\mathbf{P}$ *in* $K[U][X]$*. For any* $a \in \overline{K}^d$*, if* $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(\mathrm{a})) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(\mathrm{a})\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}(a)})$ *and* $\mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{T}) = \mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{T}(a))$ *for any* $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{T}$*, then* $\mathbb{T}$ *is said to be* stable *at a.*

Definition 3. *[4] Let* $\mathbf{T}$ *be a regular chain in* $K[U][X]$ *and* $a \in \overline{K}^d$*. If* $\mathbf{T}(a)$ *is a regular chain in* $\overline{K}[X]$ *and* $\mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{T}(a)) = \mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{T})$*, then we say that the regular chain* $\mathbf{T}$ specializes well *at a.*

Suppose $\mathcal{V}$ is an *affine variety* in $\overline{K}^d$. Then $\dim(\mathcal{V})$ denotes the *dimension* of $\mathcal{V}$. Please see the precise definition of dimension of affine variety in [2].

Definition 4. *Let* $\mathbb{T}$ *be a parametric regular decomposition of a given generic zero-dimensional system* $\mathbf{P}$ *in* $K[U][X]$*. Suppose* $\mathcal{V}$ *is an affine variety in* $\overline{K}^d$ *with* $\dim(\mathcal{V}) < d$*. If for any* $a \in \overline{K}^d\backslash\mathcal{V}$*,* $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a)) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}(a)})$ *and* $\mathbf{T}$ *specializes well at a for any* $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ *if* $\mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$*, then* $\mathbb{T}$ *is said to be a* generic regular decomposition *of* $\mathbf{P}$ *and* $\mathcal{V}$ *is said to be a* regular-decomposition-unstable (RDU) variety *of* $\mathbf{P}$ *w.r.t.* $\mathbb{T}$*.*

Now consider the example $\{u, x_1, x_2\}$ in Remark 2, it is clear that $\emptyset$ is a parametric triangular decomposition and also a parametric regular decomposition of $\{u, x_1, x_2\}$ in $\mathbb{R}[u][x_1, x_2]$. This parametric regular decomposition is stable at any $a \in \mathbb{C}$ if $a \neq 0$. Thus $\emptyset$ is a generic regular decomposition of $\{u, x_1, x_2\}$ and the variety generated by u in $\mathbb{C}$ is a RDU variety of $\{u, x_1, x_2\}$ *w.r.t.* $\emptyset$. That means for almost all parameter values except some special ones, the given system $\{u, x_1, x_2\}$ has no solutions. In most cases, we don't care about those special parameter values. But if we want to know what would happen if the parameter value equals to zero in this example, we can regard u, x_1 and x_2 as x_1', x_2' and x_3', respectively. Then $\{x_1', x_2', x_3'\}$ is a constant system in $\mathbb{R}[x_1', x_2', x_3']$ and a constant system is easy to solve. This example shows our main idea in this paper. In the next section, we propose an algorithm to compute generic regular decompositions and the associated RDU varieties simultaneously for generic zero-dimensional systems.

To present the main result in the next section, we need to introduce some more notations. For any $\mathbf{P} \subset K[U][X]$, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K}}}(\mathbf{P})$ denotes the set $\{(a_1, \ldots, a_{d+n}) \in \overline{K}^{d+n} | P(a_1, \ldots, a_{d+n}) = 0, \forall P \in \mathbf{P}\}$. For any $\mathbf{B} \subset K[U]$, $\mathrm{V}^U(\mathbf{B})$ denotes the set $\{(a_1, \ldots, a_d) \in \overline{K}^d | B(a_1, \ldots, a_d) = 0, \forall B \in \mathbf{B}\}$. For any $F \in K[U][X]$, the coefficients $B_1, \ldots, B_t$ of F in X are polynomials in $K[U]$, then $\mathrm{V}^U(F)$ denotes $\mathrm{V}^U(\{B_1, \ldots, B_t\})$. Note that for two finite subsets $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{H}$ of $K[U][X]$, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P}\backslash\mathbf{H})$ denotes the set $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P})\backslash\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H})$. Similarly, we can have $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}\backslash\mathbf{H})$, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K}}}(\mathbf{P}\backslash\mathbf{H})$ and $\mathrm{V}^U(\mathbf{P}\backslash\mathbf{H})$. The following Lemma 1 is proposed in [4]. Remark that the definition of regular chain in $K[U][X]$ in this paper is not exactly the same as that in [4] as mentioned in Remark 2. Therefore, Lemma 1 here is stated in our way.

Lemma 1. [4] *Let* $\mathbf{T}$ *be a regular chain in* $K[U][X]$*. Then* $\mathbf{T}$ *specializes well at a if and only if* $a \in \overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^{\mathrm{U}}(\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}, \mathbf{T}))$*.*

3 Theory and Algorithm

3.1 Weakly Relatively Simplicial Decomposition

In this section, we introduce weakly relatively simplicial decomposition in zero-dimensional case, which is a weaker concept comparing to relatively simplicial decomposition proposed in [27].

Definition 5. *Let* $\mathbf{T}$ *be a zero-dimensional regular chain in* $K[U][X]$ *and* $P \in K[U][X]$*. Suppose* $\mathbb{H}$ *and* $\mathbb{G}$ *are two finite sets of zero-dimensional regular chains in* $K[U][X]$*. If* $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K[U]}}}(\mathbf{T} \cup \{\mathrm{P}\}) = \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K[U]}}}(\mathbf{H})$ *and* $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K[U]}}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash\mathrm{P}) = \cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K[U]}}}(\mathbf{G})$*, then* $(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G})$ *is said to be a* weakly relatively simplicial decomposition *of* $\mathbf{T}$ *w.r.t.* P *in* $K[U][X]$*.*

Definition 6. *Suppose* $(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G})$ *is a weakly relatively simplicial decomposition of a zero-dimensional regular* $\mathbf{T}$ *w.r.t. a polynomial* P *in* $K[U][X]$*. For any* $a \in \overline{K}^d$*, if*

(1) $\mathbf{T}$ *specializes well at a,*

(2) $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(\mathrm{a}) \cup \{\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{a})\}) = \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{a}))$ *and if* $\mathbb{H} \neq \emptyset$*,* $\mathbf{H}$ *specializes well at* a *for any* $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}$*,*

(3) $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(\mathrm{a}) \backslash \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{a})) = \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(\mathrm{a}))$ *and if* $\mathbb{G} \neq \emptyset$*,* $\mathbf{G}$ *specializes well at* a *for any* $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}$*,*
then the weakly relatively simplicial decomposition $(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G})$ *of* $\mathbf{T}$ *w.r.t.* P *is said to be stable at* a*.*

Remark 3. *A stronger concept, relatively simplicial decomposition, was firstly introduced by Yang and Zhang in [27, 28]. The precise definition and the algorithm can be seen in [26, 29]. Note that a relatively simplicial decomposition is a weakly relatively simplicial decomposition but the converse is not true. For instance,* $(\{\{x^2, y\}\}, \{\{x+1, y\}\})$ *is a weakly relatively simplicial decomposition of* $\{(x+1)x^2, y\}$ *w.r.t.* $x+y$ *but it is not a relatively simplicial decomposition of* $\{(x+1)x^2, y\}$ *w.r.t.* $x+y$ *because* $\mathrm{prem}(x+y, \{x^2, y\}) = x \neq 0$*.*

Now we present Algorithm 1 for computing weakly relatively simplicial decompositions[3], which is different from Algorithm `RSD` proposed in [27]. More specifically, for any zero-dimensional regular chain $\mathbf{T}$ in $K[U][X]$ and for any polynomial P in $K[U][X]$, it is noted that either the first output $\mathbb{H}$ or the second output $\mathbb{G}$ of $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ can be an empty set, but $\mathbb{H} \cup \mathbb{G}$ can't be empty since $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}) \neq \emptyset$. According to the specification of Algorithm 1 and Definition 5, $(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G})$ is a weakly relatively simplicial decomposition of $\mathbf{T}$ *w.r.t.* P. It is also noted that the third output F of $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ is a polynomial in $K[U]$ and thus $\mathrm{V}^U(F)$ is a hypersurface in $\overline{K}^d$. The specification of Algorithm 1 indicates that for any $a \in \overline{K}^d \backslash \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $(\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G})$ is stable at a.

In addition, we need to interpret some notations used in our pseudocodes. Assume that `Alg` is a name of an algorithm and $p_1, \ldots, p_t$ is a sequence of inputs of this algorithm. If the output of $\mathtt{Alg}(p_1, \ldots, p_t)$ is a finite sequence $q_1, \ldots, q_s$, q_i is denoted by $\mathtt{Alg}(p_1, \ldots, p_t)_i$ for any i $(1 \leq i \leq s)$ and also said to be the i-th output of $\mathtt{Alg}(p_1, \ldots, p_t)$. Given a finite set $S = \{s_1, \ldots, s_t\}$ and a map ϕ on S, $\mathtt{op}(S)$ denotes the finite sequence $s_1, \ldots, s_t$ and $\mathtt{map}(s \to \phi(s), S)$ denotes the set $\phi(S)$.

Before showing the termination and the correctness of Algorithm 1, we need to prepare some statements. In the following discussion, we assume that the readers are familiar with the theories of subresultants. The precise definitions of subresultant chain and regular subresultant chain can be seen in [12, 8] and Lemma 2 can be found in [8, 26].

Lemma 2. [8, 26] *Let* $\phi : \mathrm{R} \to \widetilde{\mathrm{R}}$ *be a ring homomorphism. Denote also by* ϕ *the induced homomorphism* $\tilde{\phi} : \mathrm{R}[x] \to \widetilde{\mathrm{R}}[x]$*, where both* R *and* $\widetilde{\mathrm{R}}$ *are integral domains. Suppose* F *and* G *are polynomials in* $\mathrm{R}[x]$ *and* b *and* c *are the leading coefficients of* F *and* G *respectively. Assume that* $m = \deg(F, x) \geq l = \deg(G, x) > 0$ *and* $\widetilde{m} = \deg(\phi(F), x) \geq \widetilde{l} = \deg(\phi(G), x) > 0$*. If* $\widetilde{m} > \widetilde{l}$*, let* $\widetilde{\mu} = \widetilde{m} - 1$*, otherwise,* $\widetilde{\mu} = \widetilde{m}$*. Suppose* S_j *is the* j*-th subresultant of* F *and* G *w.r.t.* x *and* $\widetilde{S_j}$ *is the* j*-th subresultant of* $\phi(F)$ *and* $\phi(G)$ *w.r.t.* x*. Then* $\phi(S_j) = \delta \cdot \widetilde{S_j}$ *for any* j $(0 \leq j < \widetilde{\mu})$*, where*

$$\delta = \begin{cases} 1, & \phi(b) \cdot \phi(c) \neq 0, \\ \phi(b)^{l - \widetilde{l}}, & \phi(b) \neq 0 \text{ and } \phi(c) = 0, \\ (-1)^{(m - \widetilde{m})(l - j)} \phi(c)^{m - \widetilde{m}}, & \phi(b) = 0 \text{ and } \phi(c) \neq 0, \\ 0, & \phi(b) = \phi(c) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, if $m > l$*, let* $\mu = m - 1$*, otherwise, let* $\mu = m$*. Suppose* R_j *is the* j*-th principal subresultant coefficient of* F *and* G *w.r.t.* x*. Then* $\phi(G) = 0$ *if* $\phi(b) \neq 0$ *and* $\phi(R_j) = 0$ *for any* j $(0 \leq j \leq \mu)$*.*

Roughly speaking, Algorithm 1 is based on Lemma 3, which is inspired by the analogous results presented in [18, 19]. We give a proof here because the results showed in Lemma 3 is not covered by what is proposed in [18, 19]. Anyway, the idea of the proof is also borrowed from [18, 19].

Lemma 3. *Given two polynomials* F *and* G *in* $K[U][X]$ $(0 < \deg(G, x_n) < \deg(F, x_n))$*, suppose* $S_{d_\upsilon}, \ldots, S_{d_1}, S_{d_0}$ *is the regular subresultant chain of* F *and* G *w.r.t.* x_n*. Let* $S_{d_{\upsilon+1}} = F$*. Assume that* R_{d_i} *is the* d_i*-th principal subresultant coefficient of* F *and* G *w.r.t.* x_n *for any* i $(0 \leq i \leq \upsilon+1)$ *and* Q_{d_i} *is the pseudoquotient of* F *and* S_{d_i} *w.r.t.* x_n *for any* i $(1 \leq i \leq \upsilon)$*. Then*

---

[3] Lines 2 and 3 of Algorithm 1 can be removed without loss of correctness.

Algorithm 1. `WRSD`

```
Input: A zero-dimensional regular chain $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, \dots, T_n\}$ in $K[U][X]$, a polynomial
       $P \in K[U][X]$, variables $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$
Output: Two finite sets of zero-dimensional regular chains $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{G}$ in $K[U][X]$ and a
        polynomial $F \in K[U]$, such that
  (1)$\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K(U)}}}(\mathbf{T} \cup \{\mathrm{P}\}) = \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K(U)}}}(\mathbf{H})$; (2)$\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K(U)}}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{P}) = \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K(U)}}}(\mathbf{G})$;
  (3)for any $a \in \overline{K}^d \backslash \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathbf{T}$ specializes well at $a$ and
  (3a)$\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(\mathrm{a}) \cup \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{a})) = \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(\mathrm{a}))$ and $\mathbf{H}$ specializes well at $a$ for any $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ if $\mathbb{H} \neq \emptyset$;
  (3b)$\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(\mathrm{a}) \backslash \mathrm{P}(\mathrm{a})) = \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(\mathrm{a}))$ and $\mathbf{G}$ specializes well at $a$ for any $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}$ if $\mathbb{G} \neq \emptyset$.
$\mathbb{H}$:=$\emptyset$, $\mathbb{G}$:=$\emptyset$, $F$:=res($\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}, \mathbf{T}$)
if $P$ is not reduced w.r.t. $\mathbf{T}$ then
    return WRSD($\mathbf{T}$, prem($P, \mathbf{T}$), $X$)
if $P = 0$ then
    return $\{\mathbf{T}\}$, $\emptyset$, $F$
if $\mathrm{cls}_P = 0$ then
    return $\emptyset$, $\{\mathbf{T}\}$, $P \cdot F$
if $\mathrm{cls}_P \neq n$ then
    $W$:=WRSD($\{T_1, \dots, T_{\mathrm{cls}_P}\}, P, \{x_1, \dots, x_{\mathrm{cls}_P}\}$)
    $\mathbb{H}$:=map($t \to t \cup \{T_{\mathrm{cls}_P+1}, \dots, T_n\}, W_1$)
    $\mathbb{G}$:=map($t \to t \cup \{T_{\mathrm{cls}_P+1}, \dots, T_n\}, W_2$)
    return $\mathbb{H}$, $\mathbb{G}$, $F \cdot W_3$
if res($P, \mathbf{T}$) $\neq 0$ then
    $F$:=$F \cdot$ res($P, \mathbf{T}$), $\mathbb{G}$:=$\{\mathbf{T}\}$
else
    compute the regular subresultant chain $S_{d_v}, \dots, S_{d_1}, S_{d_0}$ of $T_n$ and $P$ w.r.t. $x_n$
    if $n = 1$ then
        $\mathbb{H}$:=$\{\{S_{d_1}\}\}$
        Let $Q$ be the pseudoquotient of $T_1$ and $S_{d_1}$ w.r.t. $x_1$
        $\mathbb{G}$:=WRSD($\{Q\}, P, X$)$_2$, $F$:=WRSD($\{Q\}, P, X$)$_3$
    else
        $X_{n-1}$:=$X \backslash \{x_n\}$
        $\mathbb{H}_0$:=WRSD($\{T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}\}, S_{d_0}, X_{n-1}$)$_1$
        $\mathbb{G}_0$:=WRSD($\{T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}\}, S_{d_0}, X_{n-1}$)$_2$
        $\mathbb{G}$:=$\mathbb{G} \cup$ map($t \to t \cup \{T_n\}, \mathbb{G}_0$)
        $F$:=$F \cdot$ WRSD($\{T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}\}, S_{d_0}, X_{n-1}$)$_3$
        $i$:=0, $S_{d_{v+1}}$:=$T_n$
        while $\mathbb{H}_i \neq \emptyset$ do
            $i$:=$i + 1$, $\mathbb{H}_i$:=$\emptyset$, $\mathbb{G}_i$:=$\emptyset$
            Let $R_{d_i}$ be the $d_i$-th principal subresultant coefficient of $T_n$ and $P$ w.r.t. $x_n$
            for $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{i-1}$ do
                $\mathbb{H}_i$:=$\mathbb{H}_i \cup$ WRSD($\mathbf{H}, R_{d_i}, X_{n-1}$)$_1$
                $\mathbb{G}_i$:=$\mathbb{G}_i \cup$ WRSD($\mathbf{H}, R_{d_i}, X_{n-1}$)$_2$
                $F$:=$F \cdot$ WRSD($\mathbf{H}, R_{d_i}, X_{n-1}$)$_3$
            for $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}_i$ do
                $\mathbb{H}$:=$\mathbb{H} \cup \{\mathbf{G} \cup \{S_{d_i}\}\}$
                Let $Q$ be the pseudoquotient of $T_n$ and $S_{d_i}$ w.r.t. $x_n$
                if deg($Q, x_n$) $> 0$ then
                    $\mathbb{G}$:=$\mathbb{G} \cup$ WRSD($\mathbf{G} \cup \{Q\}, P, X$)$_2$
                    $F$:=$F \cdot$ WRSD($\mathbf{G} \cup \{Q\}, P, X$)$_3$
return $\mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G}, F$
```

(1)$\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{F,G\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_F)=\cup_{i=1}^{\upsilon+1}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i},R_{d_{i-1}},\ldots,R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_i})$;

(2)$\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(F\backslash G\mathrm{I}_F)=\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(F\backslash G\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_0})\cup\cup_{i=1}^{\upsilon}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{Q_{d_i},R_{d_{i-1}},\ldots,R_{d_0}\}\backslash G\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_i})$.

Proof. Assume that $S_{\mu+1},S_\mu,\ldots,S_1,S_0$ is the subresultant chain of F and G *w.r.t.* x_n. Remark that $S_{d_0}=S_0=\mathrm{res}(F,G)$, $S_\mu=G$, $S_{\mu+1}=F$ and $S_{d_\upsilon}=\mathrm{I}_G{}^cG$ where c is a non-negative integer.

(1)Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{F,G\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_F)\neq\emptyset$. For any $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\in\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{F,G\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_F)$, let $b=(a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1})$. If $G(b)=0$, by the definition of principal subresultant coefficient, $R_{d_i}(b)=0$ and thus $R_{d_i}(a)=0$ for any i $(1\le i\le\upsilon)$. Hence, $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\in\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_{\upsilon+1}},R_{d_\upsilon},\ldots,R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_{\upsilon+1}})$. If $\deg(G(b),x_n)>0$, since $\deg(G(b),x_n)<\deg(F(b),x_n)=\deg(F,x_n)$, it is reasonable to assume that the subresultant chain of $F(b)$ and $G(b)$ *w.r.t.* x_n is $\widetilde{S}_{\mu+1},\widetilde{S}_\mu,\ldots,\widetilde{S}_1,\widetilde{S}_0$ and the associated principal coefficients are $\widetilde{R}_{\mu+1},\widetilde{R}_\mu,\ldots,\widetilde{R}_1,\widetilde{R}_0$. Note that $\widetilde{S}_\mu=G(b),\widetilde{S}_{\mu+1}=F(b)$ and by Lemma 2, we know that $S_j(b)=\mathrm{I}_F(b)^{r_j}\widetilde{S}_j$ where r_j is a non-negative integer for any j $(1\le j\le\mu+1)$. According to the theories of subresultant chains, there exists an integer j $(1\le j\le\mu)$ such that $\widetilde{R}_j\neq0$ and $\widetilde{R}_0=\ldots=\widetilde{R}_{j-1}=0$. Then $R_j(b)\neq0$ and $R_0(b)=\ldots=R_{j-1}(b)=0$. In addition, $\widetilde{S}_j$ is the greatest common divisor of $F(b)$ and $G(b)$ in $\overline{K[U]}[x_n]$ and $\deg(\widetilde{S}_j,x_n)=j$. Hence $\widetilde{S}_j(a_n)=0$ by $F(b)(a_n)=G(b)(a_n)=0$. Note that $\deg(S_j,x_n)=\deg(S_j(b),x_n)=\deg(\widetilde{S}_j,x_n)=j$, so there exists some i $(1\le i\le\upsilon)$ such that $d_i=j$. Therefore, $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\in\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i},R_{d_{i-1}},\ldots,R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_i})$.

On the other hand, for any $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\in\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_{\upsilon+1}},R_{d_\upsilon},\ldots,R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_{\upsilon+1}})$, let $b=(a_1,\ldots,a_{n-1})$. As $R_{d_i}(b)=0$ for any i $(1\le i\le\upsilon)$, $G(b)=0$ follows from Lemma 2. Hence, $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\in\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{F,G\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_F)$. For any i $(1\le i\le\upsilon)$ and for any $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\in\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i},R_{d_{i-1}},\ldots,R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_i})$, it is not difficult to check $(a_1,\ldots,a_n)\in\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{F,G\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_F)$ similarly as what has been discussed in the last paragraph.

(2) The proof is similar to that of (1). ☐

Remark 4. *If F and G are polynomials in $\overline{K}[X]$ $(0<\deg(G,x_n)<\deg(F,x_n))$, suppose $S_{d_\upsilon},\ldots,S_{d_1},S_{d_0}$ is the regular subresultant chain of F and G w.r.t. x_n. Let $S_{d_{\upsilon+1}}=F$. Assume that R_{d_i} is the d_i-th principal subresultant coefficient of F and G w.r.t. x_n for any i $(0\le i\le\upsilon+1)$ and Q_{d_i} is the pseudoquotient of F and S_{d_i} w.r.t. x_n for any i $(1\le i\le\upsilon)$. Similarly, we have*
(1)$\mathrm{V}(\{F,G\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_F)=\cup_{i=1}^{\upsilon+1}\mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_i},R_{d_{i-1}},\ldots,R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_i})$;
(2)$\mathrm{V}(F\backslash G\mathrm{I}_F)=\mathrm{V}(F\backslash G\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_0})\cup\cup_{i=1}^{\upsilon}\mathrm{V}(\{Q_{d_i},R_{d_{i-1}},\ldots,R_{d_0}\}\backslash G\mathrm{I}_FR_{d_i})$.

Lemma 4. *Let $P\in K[U][X]$ and $\mathbf{T}=\{T_1,\ldots,T_n\}$ be a zero-dimensional regular chain in $K[U][X]$. If $S_0=\mathrm{res}(P,\mathbf{T})\neq0$, then $\mathrm{res}(P(a),\mathbf{T}(a))\neq0$ for any $a\in\overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(S_0\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}},\mathbf{T}))$.*

Proof. For any $a\in\overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(S_0\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}},\mathbf{T}))$, we prove the conclusion by induction on n. When $n=1$, it is not difficult to check that $S_0(a)=\pm\mathrm{I}_{T_1}(a)^k\mathrm{res}(P(a),T_1(a))$ where k is a non-negative integer by the definition of resultant. Then $\mathrm{res}(P(a),\mathbf{T}(a))=\mathrm{res}(P(a),T_1(a))\neq0$ since $S_0(a)\neq0$. Assume that the conclusion holds when $n<N$ $(N>1)$. If $n=N$, let $R_n=\mathrm{res}(P,T_n)$ and $\mathbf{T}_{n-1}=\{T_1,\ldots,T_{n-1}\}$. Since $S_0=\mathrm{res}(R_n,\mathbf{T}_{n-1})$, $\mathrm{res}(R_n(a),\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a))\neq0$ by the induction hypothesis. Note that $R_n(a)=\pm\mathrm{I}_{T_n}(a)^k\mathrm{res}(P(a),T_n(a))$ where k is a non-negative integer by the definition of resultant and $\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)$ is a zero-dimensional regular chain in $\overline{K}[X]$ by Lemma 1. By Remark 1(3), $\mathrm{res}(P(a),\mathbf{T}(a))=\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{res}(P(a),T_n(a)),\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a))\neq0$. ☐

Lemma 5. *Given a zero-dimensional regular chain $\mathbf{T}=\{T_1,\ldots,T_n\}$ in $K[U][X]$ and a polynomial $P\in K[U][X]$, suppose $P_1=\mathrm{prem}(P,\mathbf{T})$. Then $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\cup\{P\})=\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\cup\{P_1\})$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash P)=\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash P_1)$. Furthermore, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)\cup\{P(a)\})=\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)\cup\{P_1(a)\})$ and $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)\backslash P(a))=\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)\backslash P_1(a))$ for any $a\in\overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}},\mathbf{T}))$.*

Proof. According to the definition of successive pseudodivision, $P\Pi_{i=1}^n\mathrm{I}_{T_i}^{r_i}=\sum_{i=1}^nT_iQ_i+P_1$ where $Q_1,\ldots,Q_n$ are polynomials in $K[U][X]$ and $r_1,\ldots,r_n$ are non-negative integers. Note that for any $a\in\overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}},\mathbf{T}))$, $\mathbf{T}$ specializes well at a by Lemma 1. Then it is not difficult to verify that Lemma 5 holds. ☐

Theorem 1. *Algorithm 1 terminates correctly.*

Proof. The termination is similar as the termination of Algorithm RSD in [27, 28]. For a given zero-dimensional regular chain $\mathbf{T} = \{T_1, \ldots, T_n\}$ in $K[U][X]$ and a polynomial P in $K[U][X]$, let $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X) = \mathbb{H}, \mathbb{G}, F$. Now we prove the correctness by induction on the recursive depth h of $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$.

When $h = 1$, according to Algorithm 1, P is reduced *w.r.t.* $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ can return at Line 5, Line 7, or Line 14. If $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ returns at Line 5 or Line 7, the conclusion follows from Lemma 1. If $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ returns at Line 14, the conclusion follows from Lemma 4. Assume that the conclusion holds when $h < N$ $(N > 1)$. Suppose $h = N$. Then $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ can return at Line 3, Line 12, or Line 41. If $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ returns at Line 3, the conclusion follows from the induction hypothesis and Lemma 5. If $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ returns at Line 12, the conclusion follows from the induction hypothesis. Now we prove the conclusion when $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ returns at Line 41, which means P is reduced *w.r.t.* $\mathbf{T}$, $\mathrm{mvar}(P) = x_n$ and $\mathrm{res}(P, \mathbf{T}) = 0$. Suppose $S_{\mu+1}, S_\mu, \ldots, S_1, S_0$ is the subresultant chain of T_n and P *w.r.t.* x_n in $K[U, X_{n-1}][x_n]$ where $X_{n-1} = X\backslash\{x_n\}$ and $S_{d_\upsilon}, \ldots, S_{d_1}, S_{d_0}$ is the associated regular subresultant chain. Note that $\deg(T_n, x_n) > \deg(P, x_n) > 0$ since P is reduced *w.r.t.* $\mathbf{T}$.

If $n = 1$, S_{d_1} is the greatest common divisor of T_1 and P in $K[U][x_1]$ and hence $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{T_1, P\}) = \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_1}\})$. Then the claim (1) in the specification of Algorithm 1 holds. Suppose Q is the pseudoquotient of T_n and S_{d_1} *w.r.t.* x_1. Remark that $\deg(Q, x_1) > 0$ and there exists a positive integer k such that $k \geq 2$ and $\mathrm{I}_{S_{d_1}}^k T_1 = S_{d_1}Q$. Thus $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}) = \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(S_{d_1}Q)$. Note that $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(S_{d_1}) \subset \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(P)$. So $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash P) = \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(S_{d_1}Q\backslash P) = \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(Q\backslash P)$. Therefore the claim (2) in the specification of Algorithm 1 follows from the induction hypothesis. Remark that $\mathrm{I}_{S_{d_1}}$ is a factor of I_Q and according to Algorithm 1, I_Q is a factor of F. Thus for any $a \in \overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathrm{I}_{T_1}(a) \neq 0$ and $\deg(P(a), x_1) \geq d_1 > 0$ by the definition of subresultant. According to Lemma 2, $S_{d_1}(a)$ is the great common divisor of $P(a)$ and $T_1(a)$ in $\overline{K}[x_1]$. Thus $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \cup P(a)) = \mathrm{V}(S_{d_1}(a))$. Since $\mathrm{I}_{S_{d_1}}(a)^k T_1(a) = S_{d_1}(a)Q(a)$ and $\mathrm{V}(S_{d_1}(a)) \subset \mathrm{V}(P(a))$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)\backslash P(a)) = \mathrm{V}(S_{d_1}(a)Q(a)\backslash P(a)) = \mathrm{V}(Q(a)\backslash P(a))$. Therefore the claim (3) in the specification of Algorithm 1 follows from the induction hypothesis.

If $n > 1$, let $S_{d_{\upsilon+1}} = S_{\mu+1}$ and $\mathbf{T}_{n-1} = \{T_1, \ldots, T_{n-1}\}$. Suppose R_{d_i} is the principal subresultant coefficient of T_n and P *w.r.t.* x_n for any i $(0 \leq i \leq \upsilon + 1)$ and assume that $\mathbb{H}_0 = \mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}, S_{d_0}, X_{n-1})_1$ and $\mathbb{G}_0 = \mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}, S_{d_0}, X_{n-1})_2$. Remark that $\mathbb{H}_0 \neq \emptyset$ because $\mathrm{res}(R_{d_0}, \mathbf{T}_{n-1}) = \mathrm{res}(P, \mathbf{T}) = 0$. For any i $(1 \leq i)$, let $\mathbb{H}_i = \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{i-1}}\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{H}, R_{d_i}, X_{n-1})_1$ and $\mathbb{G}_i = \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{i-1}}\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{H}, R_{d_i}, X_{n-1})_2$ until there exists an integer l $(1 \leq l \leq \upsilon+1)$ such that $\mathbb{H}_l = \emptyset$. That means $\mathbb{H}_l = \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{H}_j \neq \emptyset$ for any j $(0 \leq j < l)$. We can always get this integer l owing to the fact that $S_{d_{\upsilon+1}} = T_n$. Then we have two sequences $\mathbb{H}_0, \mathbb{H}_1, \ldots, \mathbb{H}_l$ and $\mathbb{G}_0, \mathbb{G}_1, \ldots, \mathbb{G}_l$. Let $L_1 = \{i | 1 \leq i \leq l, \mathbb{G}_i \neq \emptyset\}$. According to Algorithm 1, the first output of $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}, P, X)$ is $\mathbb{H} = \cup_{i\in L_1} \cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}_i} (\mathbf{G} \cup \{S_{d_i}\})$. It is not difficult to see that $\mathbb{H}$ is a finite set of zero-dimensional regular chains in $K[U][X]$. By Lemma 3(1), we know that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \cup \{P\})\\
&= \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(T_n \cup \{P\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{T_n})\\
&= \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}) \cap \cup_{i=1}^{\upsilon+1}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{T_n}R_{d_i})\\
&= \cup_{i=1}^{\upsilon+1}(\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{T_n}R_{d_i}))
\end{aligned}
$$

For any i $(1 \leq i \leq \upsilon + 1)$, If $i \in L_1$, according to the induction hypothesis and the construction of $\mathbb{G}_i$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_0}\}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{T_n}R_{d_i})\\
&= \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_0}\}\backslash R_{d_i})\\
&= \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1} \cup \{R_{d_0}\}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_1}\}\backslash R_{d_i})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_0}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_1}\}\backslash R_{d_i})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_0}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H} \cup \{R_{d_1}\}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_2}\}\backslash R_{d_i})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_1}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_2}\}\backslash R_{d_i})
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \ldots = \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{i-1}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}\}\backslash R_{d_i})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{i-1}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}\backslash R_{d_i}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}\})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}_{i}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{G}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}\})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}_{i}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{G} \cup \{S_{d_i}\}).
\end{aligned}
$$

If $l < i \le \upsilon + 1$, according to the induction hypothesis and $\mathbb{H}_l = \emptyset$, similarly, we know that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_0}\}\backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n} R_{d_i})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{l}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_{l+1}}\}\backslash R_{d_i})\\
&= \emptyset.
\end{aligned}
$$

If $1 \le i \le l$ and $i \notin L_1$, similarly, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}, R_{d_{i-1}}, \ldots, R_{d_0}\}\backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n} R_{d_i})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{i-1}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}\}\backslash R_{d_i})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{i-1}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}\backslash R_{d_i}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}\})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}_{i}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{G}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\{S_{d_i}\})\\
&= \emptyset.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \cup \{P\}) = \cup_{i\in L_1} \cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}_i} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{G} \cup \{S_{d_i}\}) = \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H})$ and hence the claim (1) in the specification of Algorithm 1 holds. Furthermore, as discussed above, we figure out that $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\cup\{P\}) = \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathbb{H} = \emptyset$. Actually, when $\mathrm{res}(P, \mathbf{T}) = 0$, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\cup\{P\})$ can't be $\emptyset$ according to Proposition 2(3) and thus $\mathbb{H} \neq \emptyset$. Similarly, we can prove that the claim (2) in the specification of Algorithm 1 holds on the basis of Lemma 3(2). Besides, it also can be shown that $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash P) = \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathbb{G} = \emptyset$.

For any $a \in \overline{K}^d \backslash \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, it is easy to check that $\mathbf{H}$ specializes well at a for any $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}$ by the induction hypothesis and we only need to prove that $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \cup \{P(a)\}) = \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a))$. If $\deg(P(a), x_n) = 0$, by the definition of principal subresultant coefficients, $R_{d_i}(a) = 0$ for any i $(1 \le i \le \upsilon)$. Thus it is not difficult to check that $\mathbb{G}_i = \emptyset$ $(1 \le i \le \upsilon)$ and hence $\mathbb{H} = \cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}_{\upsilon+1}}\{\mathbf{G} \cup \{S_{d_{\upsilon+1}}\}\}$. Note that $R_{d_0}(a) = \mathrm{I}_{T_n}(a)^{\deg(P,x_n)} P(a)^{\deg(T_n,x_n)}$, so $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \cup \{P(a)\}) = \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \cup \{R_{d_0}(a)\})$. By $\mathbb{G}_i = \emptyset$ $(1 \le i \le \upsilon)$ and the induction hypothesis,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}_{\upsilon+1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(a) \cup \{S_{d_{\upsilon+1}}(a)\})\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{\upsilon}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a)\backslash R_{d_{\upsilon+1}}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(T_n(a))\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{\upsilon-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{T_n(a), R_{d_\upsilon}(a)\}\backslash R_{d_{\upsilon+1}}(a))\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{\upsilon-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(T_n(a)\backslash R_{d_{\upsilon+1}}(a))\\
&= \ldots = \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{0}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{T_n(a), R_{d_1}(a)\}\backslash R_{d_{\upsilon+1}}(a))\\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}_{0}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(T_n(a)\backslash R_{d_{\upsilon+1}}(a))\\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a))) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{T_n(a), R_{d_0}(a)\}\backslash R_{d_{\upsilon+1}}(a))\\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \cup \{R_{d_0}(a)\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \cup \{P(a)\}) = \cup_{\mathbf{H}\in\mathbb{H}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a))$.

If $\deg(P(a), x_n) > 0$, it is reasonable to assume that the subresultant chain of $T_n(a)$ and $P(a)$ *w.r.t.* x_n is $\widetilde{S}_{\mu+1}, \widetilde{S}_{\mu}, \ldots, \widetilde{S}_0$. By Lemma 2, we know that $S_i(a) = \mathrm{I}_{T_n}(a)^{r_i} \widetilde{S}_i$ where r_i is a non-negative integer for any i $(0 \le i \le \mu + 1)$. Suppose $L_2 = \{i | 1 \le i \le \upsilon + 1, R_{d_i}(a) \neq 0\}$. It is not difficulty to check that $L_1 \subset L_2$ by the induction hypothesis and it is reasonable to assume that $L_2 = \{j_1, \ldots, j_k, j_{k+1}\}$ $(k \ge 1)$ such that $0 < d_{j_1} < \ldots < d_{j_k} < d_{j_{k+1}} = d_{\upsilon+1}$. Then

$\widetilde{S}_0, \widetilde{S}_{d_{j_1}}, \ldots, \widetilde{S}_{d_{j_k}}$ is the regular subresultant chain of $T_n(a)$ and $P(a)$ *w.r.t.* x_n. By Remark 3(1),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \cup \{P(a)\}) \\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(T_n(a) \cup \{P(a)\}) \\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(T_n(a) \cup \{P(a)\} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n(a)}) \\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \cup_{t=1}^{k+1} \mathrm{V}(\{\widetilde{S}_{d_{j_t}}, \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_{t-1}}}, \ldots, \widetilde{R}_{d_0}\} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n(a)} \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_t}}) \\
&= \cup_{t=1}^{k+1} (\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{\widetilde{S}_{d_{j_t}}, \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_{t-1}}}, \ldots, \widetilde{R}_{d_0}\} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n(a)} \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_t}})) \\
&= \cup_{j_t \in L_2} (\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{\widetilde{S}_{d_{j_t}}, \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_{t-1}}}, \ldots, \widetilde{R}_{d_0}\} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n(a)} \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_t}}))
\end{aligned}$$

For any $j_t \in L_2$, if $j_t \in L_1$, then by the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{\widetilde{S}_{d_{j_t}}, \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_{t-1}}}, \ldots, \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_1}}, \widetilde{R}_{d_0}\} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n(a)} \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_t}}) \\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_{j_t}}(a), R_{d_{j_{t-1}}}(a), \ldots, R_{d_{j_1}}(a), R_{d_0}(a)\} \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{j_t-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{j_t}(a)\} \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{j_t-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a) \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_{j_t}}(a)\}) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{j_t}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_{j_t}}(a)\}) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{j_t}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(a) \cup \{S_{d_{j_t}}(a)\})
\end{aligned}$$

For any $j_t \in L_2 \backslash L_1$, if $j_t \leq l$, by the induction hypothesis, $\cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{j_t-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a) \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) = \emptyset$ since $\mathbb{G}_{j_t} = \emptyset$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{\widetilde{S}_{d_{j_t}}, \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_{t-1}}}, \ldots, \widetilde{R}_{d_0}\} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n(a)} \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_t}}) \\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_{j_t}}(a), R_{d_{j_{t-1}}}(a), \ldots, R_{d_0}(a)\} \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{j_t-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_{j_t}}(a)\} \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{j_t-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a) \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_{j_t}}(a)\}) \\
&= \emptyset.
\end{aligned}$$

If $j_t > l$, by the induction hypothesis, $\cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{l-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a) \cup \{R_{d_l}(a)\}) = \emptyset$ since $\mathbb{H}_l = \emptyset$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{\widetilde{S}_{d_{j_t}}, \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_{t-1}}}, \ldots, \widetilde{R}_{d_0}\} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_n(a)} \widetilde{R}_{d_{j_t}}) \\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-1}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_{j_t}}(a), R_{d_{j_{t-1}}}(a), \ldots, R_{d_0}(a)\} \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}_{l-1}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\{S_{d_{j_t}}(a), R_{d_{j_t-1}}(a), \ldots, R_{d_{l+1}}(a), R_{d_l}(a)\} \backslash R_{d_{j_t}}(a)) \\
&= \emptyset
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \cup \{P(a)\}) = \cup_{j_t \in L_1} \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}_{j_t}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(a) \cup \{S_{j_t}(a)\}) = \cup_{\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{H}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}(a))$ and hence the claim(3a) in the specification of Algorithm 1 holds. It is similar to check that the claim (3b) in the specification of Algorithm 1 holds by Remark 3(2). $\square$

3.2 Converting To Regular Chains

Let $\mathbf{T}$ be a triangular set in $K[U][X]$. If mvar($\mathbf{T}$)=X, we can compute a finite set $\mathbb{G}$ of zero-dimensional regular chains in $K[U][X]$ and a polynomial $F \in K[U]$ on the basis of Algorithm 1 such that $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) = \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{G})$ and for any $a \in \overline{K}^d \backslash \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}(a)) = \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(a))$ and $\mathbf{G}$ specializes well at a for any $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}$ if $\mathbb{G} \neq \emptyset$. The algorithm is presented as Algorithm 2, which plays a key role in Algorithm 3 proposed in the next section.

Theorem 2. *Algorithm 2 terminates correctly.*

Proof. If the input $\mathbf{T}$ is a regular chain, then the termination holds obviously and the correctness follows from Lemma 1. Now we assume that $\mathbf{T}$ is not a regular chain and let k be the minimal integer k ($1 \leq k < n$) such that $\mathbf{T}_k = \{T_1, \ldots, T_k\}$ is a regular chain and $\{T_1, \ldots, T_{k+1}\}$ is not a regular chain. Remark that this assumption is reasonable owing to the fact that at least $\{T_1\}$ is a regular chain in $K[U][X]$. Let $\mathbf{T}_{n-k} = \{T_{k+1}, \ldots, T_n\}$.

First of all, we prove the termination. Assume that $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{T}, X)$ doesn't terminate. Then we can get at least one regular chain $\mathbf{R} \in \mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}_k, \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}, \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\})_2$ such that $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{R} \cup \mathbf{T}_{n-k}, X)$ can't terminate. According to Algorithm 2, there exists k_2 $(1 \leq k_2 < n)$ such that k_2 is the minimal integer such that $\mathbf{R} \cup \{T_{k+1}, \ldots, T_{k_2}\}$ is a regular chain but $\mathbf{R} \cup \{T_{k+1}, \ldots, T_{k_2+1}\}$ is not a regular chain. It is easy to check that $k_2 > k$. Since $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{R} \cup \mathbf{T}_{n-k}, X)$ doesn't terminate, the rest can be done in the same manner and we can get an infinite sequence of positive integers $k = k_1 < k_2 < \ldots < k_t < \ldots$. Note that all positive integers in this infinite sequence must equal to or be less than n and it's impossible obviously. Therefore, Algorithm 2 terminates.

Now we prove the correctness by induction on the recursive depth h. If $h = 1$, which implies $\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}_k, \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}, \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\})_2 = \emptyset$, then $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{T}, X) = \emptyset, \mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}_k, \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}, \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\})_3$. Let $F = \mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{T}, X)_2$. According to Algorithm 1, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K[U]}}}(\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{k}} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}) = \emptyset$ and for any $a \in \overline{K}^d \backslash \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{\mathrm{k}}(\mathrm{a}) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}(\mathrm{a})) = \emptyset$. That means $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) = \emptyset$ and for any $a \in \overline{K}^d \backslash \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}(a)) = \emptyset$. Thus the specification of Algorithm 2 holds.

Assume that the specification of Algorithm 2 holds for $h < N$ $(N > 1)$. If $h = N$, assume that $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{T}, X) = \mathbb{G}, F$. Let W=$\mathtt{WRSD}(\mathbf{T}_k, \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}, \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\})$. Then we can assume that W_2 is a non-empty set $\{\mathbf{H}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{H}_m\}$ of zero-dimensional regular chains in $K[U][x_1, \ldots, x_k]$. Let $\mathbf{R}_i = \mathbf{H}_i \cup \mathbf{T}_{n-k}$ for any i $(1 \leq i \leq m)$. Note that W_3 is a factor of F. By Algorithm 1, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_k \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}) = \cup_{i=1}^m \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}_i)$ and for any $a \in \overline{K}^d \backslash V^U(F)$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_k(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}(a)) = \cup_{i=1}^m \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}_i(a))$. Let $L = \{i | 1 \leq i \leq m, \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{R}_i \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{R}_i}) \neq \emptyset\}$. Then $\mathbb{G} = \cup_{i \in L} \mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{R}_i, X)_1$ and $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{R}_i, X)_2$ is a factor of F for any i $(1 \leq i \leq m)$. Thus by the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) \\
&= \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{k-1} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-k} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}_{n-k}}) \\
&= \cup_{i=1}^m \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{H}_i) \cap \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}_{n-k} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}_{n-k}}) \\
&= \cup_{i=1}^m \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{R}_i \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{R}_i}) \\
&= \cup_{i \in L} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{R}_i \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{R}_i}) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}} \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{G}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the claim (1) in the specification of Algorithm 2 holds and from the proof one can see that $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T} \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}) = \emptyset$ if and only if $\mathbb{G} = \emptyset$. If $\mathbb{G} \neq \emptyset$, every $\mathbf{G}$ in $\mathbb{G}$ must be returned by Line 2 in some recursion according to Algorithm 2. For this reason, $\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{G}}, \mathbf{G})$ is a factor of F. Hence for any $a \in \overline{K}^d \backslash \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathbf{G}$ specializes well at a by Lemma 1. Furthermore, whether $\mathbb{G} = \emptyset$ or not, by the induction hypothesis we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}(a)) \\
&= \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{k-1}(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}}(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-k}(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}_{n-k}}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{i=1}^m \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{H}_i(a)) \cap \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}_{n-k}(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}_{n-k}}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{i=1}^m \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{R}_i(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{R}_i}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{i \in L} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{R}_i(a) \backslash \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{R}_i}(a)) \\
&= \cup_{\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{G}} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(a)).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, the claim (2) in the specification of Algorithm 2 holds. □

3.3 Computing RDU Varieties

We present the main result in this section. Algorithm 3 shows how to compute a generic regular decomposition and the associated RDU variety of a given generic zero-dimensional system simultaneously. As a matter of fact, whether a given system is generic zero-dimensional can be checked by the Algorithm 3 itself. For this reason, we just assume that the input system of Algorithm 3 is always generic zero-dimensional.

Algorithm 2. `ZDToRC`

```
Input: A triangular set $\mathbf{T}=\{T_1,\ldots,T_n\}$ in $K[U][X]$ satisfying $\mathrm{mvar}(\mathbf{T})=X$, variables
       $X=\{x_1,\ldots,x_n\}$.
Output: A finite set $\mathbb{G}$ of zero-dimensional regular chains in $K[U][X]$ and a polynomial
        $F\in K[U]$, such that
  (1)$\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}})=\cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{G})$;
  (2)for any $a\in\overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}(a))=\cup_{\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{G}(a))$ and $\mathbf{G}$ specializes well at $a$ for
  any $\mathbf{G}\in\mathbb{G}$ if $\mathbb{G}\neq\emptyset$.
if $\mathbf{T}$ is a regular chain then
    return $\{\mathbf{T}\}$, $\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}},\mathbf{T})$
else
    Find the minimal integer $k$ $(1\le k<n)$ such that $\mathbf{T}_k=\{T_1,\ldots,T_k\}$ is a regular chain
    and $\mathbf{T}_{k+1}=\{T_1,\ldots,T_k,T_{k+1}\}$ is not a regular chain
$W$: =WRSD($\mathbf{T}_k,\mathrm{I}_{T_{k+1}},\{x_1,\ldots,x_k\}$)
if $W_2=\emptyset$ then
    return $\emptyset, W_3$
$F$: $=W_3$, $\mathbb{G}$: $=\emptyset$
for $\mathbf{T}$ in $W_2$ do
    $\mathbf{R}$: $=\{\mathrm{op}(\mathbf{T}),T_{k+1},\ldots,T_n\}$
    $\mathbb{G}$: $=\mathbb{G}\cup$ZDToRC($\mathbf{R},X$)$_1$, $F$: $=F\cdot$ZDToRC($\mathbf{R},X$)$_2$
return $\mathbb{G}$, $F$
```

Lemma 6. *Given a zero-dimensional regular chain* $\mathbf{T}$ *in* $K[U][X]$ *and a finite set of polynomials* $\mathbf{P}\subset K[U][X]$*, suppose* $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T})\subset\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P})$*. Then* $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a))\subset\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a))$ *for any* $a\in\overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}},\mathbf{T}))$.

Proof. By Proposition 2(3), $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}})=\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T})$. Then $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}})\subset\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P})$. By Proposition 2(2), $\mathbf{P}\subset\mathrm{sqrt}(\mathrm{sat}(\mathbf{T})_{K[U][X]})$ and hence for any $P\in\mathbf{P}$, there exist a positive integer k such that $P^k\in\mathrm{sat}(\mathbf{T})_{K[U][X]}$. By Proposition 2(1), $\mathrm{prem}(P^k,\mathbf{T})=0$. Remark that $P^k\in K[U][X]$ and $\mathbf{T}\subset K[U][X]$, so $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}})\subset\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K}}(P^k)=\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K}}(P)$. For any $a=(a_1,\ldots,a_d)\in\overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}},\mathbf{T}))$, $\mathbf{T}(a)$ is a zero-dimensional regular chain in $\overline{K}[X]$ and $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}(a)\neq0$ by Lemma 1. Hence $\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}(a),\mathbf{T}(a))=\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}(a)},\mathbf{T}(a))\neq0$ and thus for any $b=(b_1,\ldots,b_n)\in\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a))$, $b\notin\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}(a))$. That implies $(a_1,\ldots,a_d,b_1,\ldots,b_n)\in\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K}}(\mathbf{T}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}})\subset\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K}}(\mathbf{P})$. Therefore, $b\in\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(\mathrm{a}))$ and then $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a))\subset\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(\mathrm{a}))$. □

Theorem 3. *Algorithm 3 terminates correctly.*

Proof. Since the termination follows from the termination of Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, we only need to prove the correctness. Assume that $\mathbf{P}$ is a generic zero-dimensional system in $K[U][X]$ and $\{\mathbf{C}_1,\ldots,\mathbf{C}_m\}$ is a Wu's decomposition of $\mathbf{P}\subset K[U][X]$ computed by Wu's method. According to Wu's method and Algorithm 2, we know that the claim (1) in the specification of Algorithm 3 holds.

Now we prove the claim (2) in the specification of Algorithm 3 by induction on m. If $m=1$, $\mathbf{C}_1$ is a characteristic set of $\mathbf{P}$ in $K[U][X]$ and $\mathbf{C}_1=\{C_1\}\subset K[U]$ by Wu's method. That means $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P})=\emptyset$. According to Algorithm 3, the first output of `RDUForZD`($\mathbf{P},X$) is $\emptyset$ and the second output is exactly C_1. In fact, for any $a\notin\mathrm{V}^U(C_1)$, $C_1(a)\in\overline{K}$. Note that $C_1(a)\in\langle\mathbf{P}(a)\rangle_{\overline{K}[X]}$ by $C_1\in\langle\mathbf{P}\rangle_{K[U][X]}$. Thus $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a))\subset\mathrm{V}(C_1(a))=\emptyset$ and the claim (2) in the specification of Algorithm 3 holds.

Assume that the conclusion holds for $m<N$ $(N>1)$. If $m=N$, suppose $\mathbf{C}_1$ is the characteristic set of $\mathbf{P}$ computed by Wu's method. Since $m>1$, we know that $\mathbf{C}_1\not\subset K[U]$ and $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P})=\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{C}_1\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1})\cup\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K[U]}}(\mathbf{P}\cup\mathbf{C}_1\cup\{\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}\})$. Let `RDUForZD`($\mathbf{P},X$) $=\mathbb{T},F$ and `ZDToRC`($\mathbf{C}_1,X$) $=\mathbb{T}_1,F_1$. Then $\mathbb{T}_1\subset\mathbb{T}$ and F_1 is a factor of F. In addition, if `RDUForZD`($\mathbf{P}\cup\mathbf{C}_1\cup\{\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}\},X$) $=\mathbb{T}_2,F_2$, we have $\mathbb{T}_1\bigcup\mathbb{T}_2=\mathbb{T}$ and $F=F_1\cdot F_2$ by Wu's method. We only prove the conclusion when $\mathbb{T}_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbb{T}_2 \neq \emptyset$. In fact, if $\mathbb{T}_1 = \emptyset$ or $\mathbb{T}_2 = \emptyset$, the proof is similar. For any $a \notin \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $a \notin V^U(F_1)$ and then $\mathrm{V}((\mathbf{P} \cup \mathbf{C}_1 \cup \{\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}\})(a)) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}_2}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a))$ by the induction hypothesis. Therefore, in order to prove $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a)) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a))$, we only need to show $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a)) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}_1}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)) \cup \mathrm{V}((\mathbf{P} \cup \mathbf{C}_1 \cup \{\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}\})(a))$. As a matter of fact, by Algorithm 2, $\cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}_1}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)) = \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{C}_1(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}(a))$. Note that $\mathbf{C}_1(a) \in \langle\mathbf{P}(a)\rangle_{\overline{K}[X]}$, so $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a)) \subset \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{C}_1(a))$. Then $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a)) \subset \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{C}_1(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}(a)) \cup \mathrm{V}((\mathbf{P} \cup \mathbf{C}_1 \cup \{\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}\})(a)) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}_1}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)) \cup \mathrm{V}((\mathbf{P} \cup \mathbf{C}_1 \cup \{\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}\})(a))$. On the other hand, by the claim (1), $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K(U)}}(\mathbf{P}) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K(U)}}(\mathbf{T})$ and thus for any $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{T}_1 \subset \mathbb{T}$, $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K(U)}}(\mathbf{T}) \subset \mathrm{V}_{\overline{K(U)}}(\mathbf{P})$. According to Algorithm 2, we know that $\mathrm{res}(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{T}}, \mathbf{T})(a) \neq 0$. By Lemma 6, $\cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}_1}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)) \cup \mathrm{V}((\mathbf{P} \cup \mathbf{C}_1 \cup \{\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}_1}\})(a)) \subset \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a))$ and we are done. □

Algorithm 3. `RDUForZD`

```
Input: A generic zero-dimensional system $\mathbf{P}$ in $K[U][X]$, variables $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$.
Output: A set $\mathbb{T}$ of zero-dimensional regular chains in $K[U][X]$ and a polynomial
        $F \subset K[U]$, such that
        (1)$\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K(U)}}(\mathbf{P}) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}}\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K(U)}}(\mathbf{T})$;
        (2)for any $a \in \overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a)) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a))$ and $\mathbf{T}$ specializes well at $a$ for any
        $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{T}$ if $\mathbb{T} \neq \emptyset$.
Compute a Wu's decomposition $\mathbb{S} = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{C}_m\}$ of $\mathbf{P}$ in $K[U][X]$ by Wu's method
$\mathbb{S}_2$:=$\mathbb{S}\backslash\{\mathbf{C}_m\}$, $F$:=op($\mathbf{C}_m$)
if $\mathbb{S}_2 = \emptyset$ then
    return $\emptyset, F$
$\mathbb{T}$:=$\emptyset$
for $\mathbf{C}$ in $\mathbb{S}_2$ do
    W:=ZDToRC($\mathbf{C}, X$)
    $\mathbb{T}$:=$\mathbb{T} \cup W_1$, $F$:=$F \cdot W_2$
return $\mathbb{T}, F$
```

For a generic zero-dimensional system $\mathbf{P}$ in $K[U][X]$. Suppose $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K(U)}}}(\mathbf{P}) \neq \emptyset$. Assume that $\mathbb{S} = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{C}_m\}$ is a Wu's decomposition of $\mathbf{P} \subset K[U][X]$ computed by Wu's method and let $\mathbb{W} = \{\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R} | \mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K(U)}}}(\mathbf{C}\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{C}}) \neq \emptyset\}$. Remark that $\mathbb{W} \neq \emptyset$ since $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathrm{K(U)}}}(\mathbf{P}) \neq \emptyset$. Obviously, $\mathbb{W}$ is a non-redundant parametric triangular decomposition of $\mathbf{P}$ in $K[U][X]$. If $F =$ `RDUForZD`$(\mathbf{P}, X)_2$, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *The non-redundant parametric triangular decomposition* $\mathbb{W}$ *of* $\mathbf{P}$ *in* $K[U][X]$ *is stable at* a *if* $a \in \overline{K}^d\backslash\mathrm{V}^U(F)$.

Proof. Assume that $\mathbb{W} = \{\mathbf{S}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{S}_t\}$. For any i $(1 \leq i \leq t)$, assume that $\mathbb{T}_i =$ `ZDToRC`$(\mathbf{S}_i, X)_1$ and according to Algorithm 3, we know that `ZDToRC`$(\mathbf{S}_i, X)_2$ is a factor of F. Then $\mathbb{T}_i \neq \emptyset$, since $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{K(U)}}(\mathbf{S}_i\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{S}_i}) \neq \emptyset$. Firstly, we need to interpret that for any $a \notin \mathrm{V}^U(F)$, $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{S}_i}(a) \neq 0$. In fact, if $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{S}_i}(a) = 0$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{S}_i(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{S}_i}(a)) = \emptyset$. On the other hand, by Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3, we know that $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{S}_i(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{S}_i}(a)) = \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}_i}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a))$. Note that $\mathbb{T}_i \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{T}(a)$ is a regular chain for any $\mathbf{T} \in \mathbb{T}_i$, so $\cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}_i}\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)) \neq \emptyset$ by Proposition 1. That implies $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{S}_i(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{S}_i}(a)) \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Therefore, by Algorithm 3, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{P}(a)) = \cup_{i=1}^t \cup_{\mathbf{T}\in\mathbb{T}_i} \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{T}(a)) = \cup_{i=1}^t\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{S}_i(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{S}_i}(a)) = \cup_{i=1}^t\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{S}_i(a)\backslash\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{S}_i(a)})$ and hence the conclusion holds. □

Corollary 1 indicates that we can also obtain a non-redundant parametric triangular decomposition of a given generic zero-dimensional system and the decomposition is stable at any parameter value that is not on the RDU variety computed by Algorithm 3. The following Example 1 is presented to illustrate how Algorithm 3 and Corollary 1 work out.

Example 1. *Consider the system*

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{cases} (u-1)x_2^2 + (x_1^2 - 2ux_1 + u^2 + 1)x_2 + x_1^2 - x_1, \\ (x_1 - u)(x_2 + 1), \\ (x_1 - u)^2 \end{cases}$$

where x_1 and x_2 are variables ($x_1 \prec x_2$) and u is a parameter.

Step 1: According to Wu's method, we compute a Wu's decomposition $\mathbb{S} = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2, \mathbf{C}_3\}$ of P in $\mathbb{R}[u][x_1, x_2]$ where $\mathbf{C}_1 = \{(x_1 - u)^2, (x_1 - u)(x_2 + 1)\}$, $\mathbf{C}_2 = \{x_1 - u, (u-1)x_2^2 + x_2 + u^2 - u\}$ and $\mathbf{C}_3 = \{u - 1\}$.

Step 2: Let $\mathbb{S}_2 = \{\mathbf{C}_1, \mathbf{C}_2\}$ and $F = \mathtt{op}(\mathbf{C}_3) = u - 1$.

Step 3: Because $\mathbb{S}_2 \neq \emptyset$, we need to execute $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{C}_1, \{x_1, x_2\})$ and $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{C}_2, \{x_1, x_2\})$.

Step 3.1: It is easy to see that $\mathbf{C}_1$ is not a regular chain in $\mathbb{R}[u][x_1, x_2]$. By calling $\mathtt{WRSD}(\{(x_1 - u)^2\}, x_1 - u, \{x_1\})$, we obtain $\mathbb{H} = \{\{x_1 - u\}\}$, $\mathbb{G} = \emptyset$ and $F_1 = 1$. Then the first and second outputs of $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{C}_1, \{x_1, x_2\})$ are $\emptyset$ and 1 respectively. That means $\mathrm{V}_{\overline{\mathbb{R}[u]}}(\mathbf{C}_1 \backslash x_1 - u) = \emptyset$ and for any $a \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathrm{V}(\mathbf{C}_1(a) \backslash x_1 - a) = \emptyset$.

Step 3.2: The first and second outputs of $\mathtt{ZDToRC}(\mathbf{C}_2, \{x_1, x_2\})$ are $\{\mathbf{C}_2\}$ and $u - 1$ respectively owing to the fact that $\mathbf{C}_2$ is a regular chain in $\mathbb{R}[u][x_1, x_2]$. In addition, we know that for any $a \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mathbf{C}_2(a)$ specializes well at a as long as $a \neq 1$ by Lemma 1.

Combining the above results together, we get a generic regular decomposition $\{\mathbf{C}_2\}$ of $\mathbf{P}$ in $\mathbb{R}[u][x_1, x_2]$ and a RDU variety $\mathcal{V} = \{a \in \mathbb{C} | a - 1 = 0\}$ such that for any $a \in \mathbb{C} \backslash \mathcal{V}$, $\mathrm{V}(P(a)) = \mathrm{V}(\mathbf{C}_2(a))$ where $\mathbf{C}_2(a)$ is a regular chain in $\mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2]$. That means for almost all parameter values, we can express the solutions of $\mathbf{P}$ by $\mathbf{C}_2$. Furthermore, It is should be noted that Algorithm 3 eliminates a redundant branch $\mathbf{C}_1$ from $\mathbb{S}_2$ and this result should be attributed to weakly relatively simplicial decomposition. As a result, we also get a non-redundant parametric triangular decomposition $\{\mathbf{C}_2\}$ of $\mathbf{P}$. As what Corollary 1 shows, this non-redundant decomposition is stable at any $a \in \mathbb{C} \backslash \mathcal{V}$.

4 Implementation

We have implemented Algorithm 3 as a function `rduforzd` on the basis of DISCOVERER [23] using Maple 15. More specifically, Wu's method for computing parametric triangular decompositions introduced in Section 2 is implemented as a function `wusolve` and Algorithm 1 is implemented as a function `wrsd`. Throughout this section, all the results are obtained in Maple 15 using an Intel(R) Core(TM) i5 processor(3. 20GHz CPU and 4GB total memory).

Table 1. *Comparing* `wrsd` *and* `rsd`

			time		$\mathbb{H}$		$\mathbb{G}$		F	
system	*U*	*X*	`wrsd`	`rsd`	`wrsd`	`rsd`	`wrsd`	`rsd`	`wrsd`	`rsd`
EX1	*3*	*7*	*0.203*	*0.296*	*1*	*1*	*2*	*2*	*11*	*11*
EX2	*2*	*6*	*0.156*	*0.234*	*1*	*1*	*2*	*2*	*9*	*9*
EX3	*4*	*6*	*0.437*	*1.061*	*1*	*1*	*2*	*2*	*10*	*10*
EX4	*3*	*6*	*1.482*	*1.452*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*11*	*11*
EX5	*4*	*4*	*0.281*	*0.281*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*9*	*9*
EX6	*4*	*4*	*0.218*	*0.218*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*9*	*7*
EX7	*3*	*3*	*0.327*	*0.375*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*8*	*8*
EX8	*3*	*3*	*0.468*	*0.577*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*1*	*7*	*7*

We run 8 examples[4] using `wrsd` and `rsd` [5] on the same computer with Maple 15 and the comparisons about timings and results are presented in Table 1, where columns X and U represent the cardinal numbers of the variables and the parameters, respectively, column *time* reports the timings in seconds, columns $\mathbb{H}$ and $\mathbb{G}$ represent the numbers of branches in the first and second outputs, respectively, column F represents the numbers of irreducible factors over the field of rational numbers of the third output. The empirical data shows that `wrsd` performs as well as `rsd` with higher efficiency in most cases.

We also run several examples from the literature using `rduforzd` with Maple 15 and part of the empirical data about timings is presented in Table 2. Therein, systems 1-4 are selected from [13], systems 5-6 and 12-14 are provided by Sun [10], systems 7-11 are modified from Examples

---

[4] http://www.is.pku.edu.cn/~xbc/ExForRSD.txt

[5] Algorithm RSD in [27] was implemented as a subfunction `rsd` in DISCOVERER by Xia [23].

2-4 in [5] and systems 15-22 are provided by Chen [4]. In Table 2, columns X and U represent the cardinal numbers of the variables and the parameters, respectively, column `wusolve` reports the timings in seconds cost by computing Wu's decompositions, column `zdtorc` represents the timings in seconds cost by computing weakly relatively simplicial decompositions and some other steps required in Algorithm 3, and column *total* shows the timings added by the timings in the former two columns. It is indicated that our method can be applied to a wide range of practical problems with reasonable time cost. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that computing generic regular decompositions and the associated RDU varieties do not require much more time cost than Wu's decompositions when solving practical problems as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. *timings of* `rduforzd`

number	*system*	*U*	*X*	`wusolve`	`zdtorc`	*total*
1.	S5	*4*	*4*	*0.016*	*0.*	*0.016*
2.	S9	*3*	*3*	*0.047*	*0.*	*0.047*
3.	S16	*3*	*12*	*0.031*	*0.*	*0.031*
4.	S18	*3*	*2*	*0.437*	*0.046*	*0.483*
5.	SY1	*3*	*2*	*0.016*	*0.015*	*0.031*
6.	SY2	*4*	*1*	*0.015*	*0.*	*0.015*
7.	SCC1	*3*	*4*	*0.016*	*0.*	*0.016*
8.	SCC2	*4*	*7*	*0.015*	*0.016*	*0.031*
9.	SCC3	*6*	*11*	*0.110*	*0.078*	*0.188*
10.	SCC4	*4*	*7*	*0.046*	*0.032*	*0.078*
11.	SCC5	*4*	*5*	*0.032*	*0.015*	*0.047*
12.	P3P	*5*	*2*	*0.031*	*0.016*	*0.047*
13.	F4	*4*	*1*	*0.016*	*0.*	*0.016*
14.	F6	*4*	*1*	*0.015*	*0.*	*0.015*
15.	Gerdt	*3*	*4*	*0.031*	*0.*	*0.031*
16.	Wang93	*2*	*3*	*0.062*	*0.*	*0.062*
17.	Leykin-1	*4*	*4*	*0.078*	*0.*	*0.078*
18.	Neural	*1*	*3*	*0.078*	*0.016*	*0.094*
19.	Pavelle	*4*	*4*	*0.140*	*0.094*	*0.234*
20.	genLinSyst-3-3	*12*	*3*	*0.032*	*0.*	*0.032*
21.	AlkashiSinus	*3*	*6*	*0.015*	*0.*	*0.015*
22.	LanconeLLi	*7*	*4*	*0.093*	*0.*	*0.093*

5 Conclusions

We give an algorithm for computing generic regular decompositions and the associated RDU varieties simultaneously for generic zero-dimensional systems in this paper. That means for almost all parameter values, we can judge whether a given generic zero-dimensional system generally has solutions and present the solutions in an algebraic closed field by finitely many zero-dimensional regular chains if it does. As a result, questions (1) and (2) in Section 1 are answered to some extent.

Remark that although we refer to many methods for computing triangular decompositions such as Wu's decomposition, relatively simplicial decomposition and regular chain decomposition in our discussion, our main direction is not to give a new method for computing triangular decompositions but to provide an idea to discuss the relationship between parameter values and representations of solutions for parametric systems. Following the idea presented in this paper, any algorithm for computing regular chain decompositions can be probably adopted to computing generic regular decompositions and the associated RDU varieties if the algorithm is based on computing resultants and pseudoremainders. Algorithm 3 can be modified so that it can be applied to deal with general systems besides generic zero-dimensional ones. Furthermore, we can answer questions (1) and (2) step by step in algebraic closed fields completely by using Algorithm 3. Actually, the concept of RDU variety is closely bound up with the concept of border polynomial (BP) in [24, 25, 26]. More precisely, if $\mathcal{V}$ is a RDU variety of $\mathbf{P}$ *w.r.t.* some generic regular decomposition, there exists a related border polynomial F of $\mathbf{P}$ such that $\mathcal{V}$ is contained in the hypersurface generated by F. A clearer characterization of the relationship between BPs and RDU varieties is interesting but not what we concern here. We'll discuss these topics in the future.

Acknowledgements

The work is partly supported by NSFC-11271034, the ANR-NSFC project EXACTA (ANR-09-BLAN-0371-01/60911130369) and the project SYSKF1207 from State Key Laboratory of Computer Science, Institute of Software, Chinese Academy of Sciences. We are indebted to Dongming Wang for his valuable comments and suggestions on an early version of this paper. We would like to thank Changbo Chen and Yao Sun for providing a great deal of test-systems. Thanks also go to Rong Xiao for his suggestions.

References

[1] P. Aubry, D. Lazard and M. Moreno. Maza: On the theories of triangular sets. *J. Symb. Comp.,* **28**: 105–124, 1999.

[2] D. Cox, J. Little and D. O'Shea: Using Algebraic Geometry. New York: Springer, 1998.

[3] C. Chen: Solving Polynomial Systems via Triangular Decomposition. Ph. D. Thesis, Universite of Western Ontario. August, 2011.

[4] C. Chen, O. Golubitsky, F. Lemaire, M. Moreno Maza and W. Pan: Comprehensive Triangular Decomposition. *Proc. CASC 2007, LNCS 4770*, 73–101, 2007.

[5] S.-C. Chou: Mechanical Geometry Theorem Proving. *D. Reidel Publishing Company*, 1987.

[6] X.-S. Gao, S.-C. Chou: Solving Parametric Algebraic Systems. *Proc. ISSAC 1992*, 335–341, ACM Press, 1992.

[7] X.-S. Gao, X. Hou, J. Tang and H. Chen: Complete Solution Classification for the Perspective-Three-Point Problem. *IEEE Tran. on PAMI*, 930–943, 25(8), 2003.

[8] M. E. Kahoui: An elementary approach to subresultants theory. *J. Symb. Comput.* , **35**: 281-292, 2003.

[9] M. Kalkbrener: A generalized Euclidean algorithm for computing for computing triangular representationa of algebraic varieties. *J. Symb. Comput.* , **15**: 143–167, 1993.

[10] D. Kapur, Y. Sun and D. Wang: A New Algorithm for Computing Comprehensive Gröbner Systems. *Proc. ISSAC 2010*, 25–28, ACM Press, 2010.

[11] M. M. Maza: On triangular decompositions of algebraic varieties. Technical Report TR 4/99, NAG Ltd, Oxford, UK, 1999. Presented at the MEGA-2000 Conference, Bath, England.

[12] B. Mishra: Algorithmic Algebra. *Springer-Verlag*, 1993.

[13] A. Montes and T. Recio: Automatic discovery of geometry theorems using minimal canonical comprehensive Gröbner systems. *ADG 2006, LNAI 4869*, 113–138, 2007.

[14] K. Nabeshima: A Speed-Up of the Algorithm for Computing Comprehensive Gröbner Systems. *Proc. ISSAC2007*, 299–306, 2007.

[15] A. Suzuki, and Y. Sato: An alternative approach to Comprehensive Gröbner bases. *Proc. ISSAC2002*, 255–261, 2002.

[16] A. Suzuki, Y. Sato: A simple algorithm to compute comprehensive Gröbner bases. *Proc. ISSAC2006*, 326–331, ACM Press, 2006.

[17] D. K. Wang: Zero Decomposition Algorithms for System of Polynomial Equations. In: *Computer Mathematics, Proc. ASCM 2000*, 67–70, 2000.

[18] D. M. Wang: Computing triangular systems and regular systems. *J. Symb. Comput.* , **30**: 221–236, 2000.

[19] D. M. Wang: *Elimination methods.* Springer, Wien New York, 2001.

[20] D. M. Wang: *Elimination Practice: Software Tools and Applications.* Imperial College Press, London, 2004.

[21] V. Weispfenning: Comprehensive Gröbner bases. *J. Symb. Comp.* , **14**: 1–29, 1992.

[22] W.-t. Wu: Basic principles of mechanical theorem proving in elementary geometries. *J. Syst. Sci. Math. Sci.* , **4**: 207–235, 1984.

[23] B. Xia: DISCOVERER: a tool for solving semi-algebraic systems. *ACM Commun. Comput. Algebra.* , **41(3)**: 102–103, 2007.

[24] L. Yang, X. Hou, and B. Xia: A complete algorithm for automated discovering of a class of inequality-type theorems. *Science in China, Series* **F**, **44(6)**:33–49, 2001.

[25] L. Yang and B. Xia: Real solution classifications of a class of parameteric semi-algebraic systems. *In Algorithmic Algebra and Logic-Proc. the A3L2005*, 281–289, Herstellung and Verlag, Norderstedt, 2005.

[26] L. Yang and B. Xia: *Automated proving and discovering inequalities* (in Chinese). Science Press, Beijing, 2008.

[27] L. Yang and J. Zhang: Searching dependency between algebraic equations: an algorithm applied to automated reasoning. *Technical Report ICTP/91/6, International Center for Theoretical Physics*, 1–12, 1991.

[28] L. Yang, J. Zhang and X. Hou: A criterion of dependency between algebraic equations and its applications. *Proc. International Workshop on Mathematics Mechanization'1992 (Wu W-T, Cheng M-D eds)*, 110–134, International Academic Publishers, Beijing, 1992.

[29] L. Yang, J. Zhang and X. Hou: Non-linear algebraic equalities and automated proving (in Chinese). Shanghai Technology Education Press Shanghai, 1996.